OGC HAS REVIEWED.

25X1A5a1

4 May 1955 25X1A9a

25X1A5a1

I have been trying unsuccessfully to reach you by telephone for the last two weeks or so to discuss the claims presented by the above-named individuals against for damage to household goods resulting from faulty

25X1A5a1

25X1A5a1

25X1A9a

packing. The packing concerned was done by in 1950 and 25X1A5a1 1951 under contract no. dated October 26, 1950 between

this Agency and Claims were submitted under date of August 21, 1951 by and September 6 1053 and September 6, 1951 by and 25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Pro forms replies were received from you each dated October 4, 1951 alleging that the packing had been done in accordance with the contract specifications. Your letters suggested that claims be presented by the carrier. This was done, and under date December 12, 1951 the carrier, **denied** 25X1A5a1 the claims on the grounds that the damage was obviously the result of faulty packing and that the crates had arrived in good condition as far as external appearance is concerned.

We wrote to on November 12, 1953 requesting settlement of these and other claims but have received no satisfaction with respect to

≘5X1A5a1

25X1A5a1

Reports of the damage involved were sent to in 1951 and presumably they were forwarded to you. In case they are not presently available to you, I am enclosing photostatic copies.

It is clear from these reports that the household goods involved could not have been packed in accordance with the specification which form a part of contract XG-448. I am therefore unable to understand your statement that they were. I would appreciate it if you would review these cases at your earliest convenience. I would be happy to discuss them with you if you feel such discussion is necessary or desirable. Maturally, we would prefer not to take formal action to secure satisfaction of these claims.

OGC: CFB: mll chrono signer subject Enclosures - 3

25X1A9a

Assistant General Counsel

Very truly yours,